

**Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of
South Dakota Game Production Areas (GPA) – 2005
HD-5-06.AMS**

**LARRY GIGLIOTTI, PH.D.
SOUTH DAKOTA GAME, FISH & PARKS**



Arikara GPA

**Game, Fish & Parks
523 E. Capitol
Pierre, South Dakota 57501**

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas (GPA) – 2005 HD-5-06.AMS

**LARRY GIGLIOTTI, PH.D.
SOUTH DAKOTA GAME, FISH & PARKS**

A non-scientific survey¹ of hunters using South Dakota Game Production Areas (GPAs) during the 2005 fall hunting season was conducted as an informal evaluation of GPAs from the hunters' perspective. Wildlife Conservation Officers were provided with a supply of survey cards (addressed, business-reply, postage-paid) to hand out to hunters using GPAs or leave on vehicles parked at GPAs (Appendix A).

Only 177 usable evaluation cards were returned representing 63 different GPAs (Tables 1 and 2). Most GPAs received only one or two responses. The highest number of responses for a GPA was 18. A total of 27 counties were represented in this survey (Table 3). The survey period ran from September 2005 through January 2006, with most (79%) occurring during October (Table 4). About 57% of the respondents were South Dakota residents (Table 5 and 5-A). About 81% of the hunters were pheasant hunting (Table 6). Average party size was 3.7 hunters (Table 7). About one-fourth of the hunting parties included young hunters (less than 16 years old) with 14% of the total hunters in the sample being young hunters (the 177 party respondents represented a total of 624 hunters).

The number of responses is too low to make any comparisons among GPAs, however an overall evaluation for the 177 respondents can be provided. Almost 80% of the 177 hunting parties reported being satisfied with their day's hunting experience, only 10% were dissatisfied (Table 8). Residents and nonresidents were statistically similar in satisfaction level (Table 9). This report also documents each hunter-party's evaluation and comments for each GPA (Table 10 and 11).

¹ The results from this non-scientific survey only represent the 177 responses received, i.e., the results may not represent all hunters using GPAs during the 2005 hunting season.

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas (GPA) – 2005 TABLES

Table 1. Number of evaluation responses received.

Parameter	Value
Total Number of Usable Responses	177
Total Number of GPAs received one or more responses	63
Number of GPAs with 1 response	23
Number of GPAs with 2 responses	18
Number of GPAs with 3 responses	9
Number of GPAs with 4 responses	3
Number of GPAs with 5 responses	4
Number of GPAs with 6 responses	2
Number of GPAs with 7 responses	1
Number of GPAs with 8 responses	1
Number of GPAs with 14 responses	1
Number of GPAs with 18 responses	1

Table 2. GPAs evaluationed.

GPA Number			
12	101	208	554
16	104	209	555
22	106	225	556
23	109	242	560
37	113	258	561
50	115	283	565
59	119	358	567
66	121	375	569
68	122	376	632
70	125	418	635
75	132	420	640
79	140	433	659
89	142	456	671
91	161	535	702
96	167	545	705
97	206	553	

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

Table 3. Counties represented in GPA evaluation.

County	Number	Percent
3 – Brown	6	3.4%
4 – Beadle	2	1.1%
10 – Aurora	4	2.3%
12 – Bon Homme	6	3.4%
13 – Brule	44	24.9%
17 – Charles Mix	12	6.8%
19 – Clay	1	0.6%
22 – Day	7	4.0%
26 – Edmunds	4	2.3%
27 – Fall River	3	1.7%
28 – Faulk	2	1.1%
30 – Gregory	12	6.8%
33 – Hand	15	8.5%
36 – Hughes	6	3.4%
38 – Hyde	3	1.7%
40 – Jerauld	2	1.1%
42 – Kingsbury	1	0.6%
44 – Lincoln	9	5.1%
45 – Lyman	19	10.7%
48 – Marshall	2	1.1%
49 – Meade	1	0.6%
51 – Miner	3	1.7%
56 – Sanborn	3	1.7%
57 – Spink	2	1.1%
59 – Sully	3	1.7%
60 – Turner	4	2.3%
62 – Union	1	0.6%
Total	177	100%

Table 4. Months GPAs evaluated.

Month/Year	Number	Percent
September - 2005	4	2.3%
October - 2005	135	78.9%
November - 2005	22	12.9%
December - 2005	4	2.3%
January - 2006	6	3.5%
Total	171	100%

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

Table 5. Residents/nonresidents hunting on GPAs and providing an evaluation.

Residence	Number	Percent
South Dakota	98	57.0%
other state	74	43.0%
Total	172	100%

Table 5-A. City/town residence for South Dakota residents.

City/Town	Number	City/Town	Number
Sioux Falls	23	Dallas	1
Rapid City	12	Dell Rapids	1
Pierre	7	Delmont	1
Chamberlain	5	Fairburn	1
Aberdeen	4	Faulkton	1
Harrisburg	4	Florence	1
Yankton	4	Gann Valley	1
Fort Pierre	3	Gregory	1
Armour	2	Harrison	1
Hartford	2	Jefferson	1
Mitchell	2	Plankton	1
Oacoma	2	Renner	1
Redfield	2	Tabor	1
Spearfish	2	Tea	1
Agar	1	Tyndall	1
Beresford	1	Vermillion	1
Canton	1	Volga	1
Chester	1	Watertown	1
Crooks	1	Winner	1
Custer	1		

Table 6. Type of hunting that occurred on the GPAs evaluated.

Hunting	Number	Percent
Pheasant/grouse	144	81.4%
Firearm Deer	22	12.4%
Other small game	11	6.2%
Waterfowl	10	5.6%
Archery Deer	10	5.6%
Other	4	2.3%
Turkey	1	0.6%
Furbearer	1	0.6%
Total	177	100%

Table 7. Party sizes for the groups that evaluated the GPAs.

Party Size	Number	Percent
1	24	14.2%
2	45	26.6%
3	33	19.5%
4	21	12.4%
5	17	10.1%
6	9	5.3%
7	2	1.2%
8	7	4.1%
9	5	3.0%
10	3	1.8%
11	1	0.6%
12	1	0.6%
20	1	0.6%
Total	169	100%
Mean	3.69	
Median	3.00	
95% Confidence Interval	3.29 – 4.10	
Percent of Parties with Hunters < 16 Years Old		25.4%
Percent of Total Hunters < 16 Years Old		14.1%
Total Hunters		624
Number of Young Hunters (<16 Years Old)		88
Parties with Young Hunters	Number	Percent
0	126	74.6%
1	19	11.2%
2	14	8.3%
3	5	3.0%
4	2	1.2%
5	1	0.6%
6	1	0.6%
7	1	0.6%
Total	169	100%

Table 8. Hunters' satisfaction with their hunting on the GPA.

Satisfaction (scale)	Number	Percent
Very Dissatisfied (-3)	5	2.9%
Moderately Dissatisfied (-2)	6	3.4%
Slightly Dissatisfied (-1)	7	4.0%
Neutral (0)	18	10.3%
Slightly Satisfied (+1)	41	23.4%
Moderately Satisfied (+2)	50	28.6%
Very Satisfied (+3)	48	27.4%
Total	175	100%
Mean / 95% C.I.	1.43	1.21 – 1.66
SUMMARIZED RESULTS		
DISSATISFIED	18	10.3%
NEUTRAL	18	10.3%
SATISFIED	139	79.4%

Table 9. Hunters' satisfaction with their hunting on the GPA comparing residents and nonresidents.

Satisfaction (scale)	Residents		Nonresidents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very Dissatisfied (-3)	2	2.1%	3	4.1%
Moderately Dissatisfied (-2)	3	3.1%	3	4.1%
Slightly Dissatisfied (-1)	5	5.2%	1	1.4%
Neutral (0)	11	11.3%	5	6.8%
Slightly Satisfied (+1)	23	23.7%	17	23.3%
Moderately Satisfied (+2)	31	32.0%	19	26.0%
Very Satisfied (+3)	22	22.7%	25	34.2%
Total	97	100%	73	100%
Mean / 95% C.I.	1.38	1.09 – 1.67	1.56	1.19 – 1.93
Chi-Square: $X^2=5.82$; df=6; $p=0.444$				
ANOVA: F=0.61; df=1/168; $p=0.437$				
SUMMARIZED RESULTS				
DISSATISFIED	10	10.3%	7	9.6%
NEUTRAL	11	11.3%	5	6.8%
SATISFIED	76	78.4%	61	83.6%
Chi-Square: $X^2=1.06$; df=2; $p=0.590$				

Table 10. Hunters' satisfaction (rating by individual party) for each GPA.

GPA	Satisfaction Responses (Number)
GPA #12-Covey Dam	Neutral (1)
GPA #16-Mclaughlin	Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #22-Wilmarth Lake	Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #23-Borden-Norwegian Slough	Slightly Satisfied (1)
GPA #37-South Bon Homme	Neutral (1)
GPA #50-Oral	Slightly Satisfied (2) Very Dissatisfied (1)
GPA #59-Marcotte	Neutral (1)
GPA #66-Boyer	Slightly Dissatisfied (2) Slightly Satisfied (2) Moderately Satisfied (2)
GPA #68-Chain Lake (Holoubek)	Very Dissatisfied (1) Neutral (1) Slightly Satisfied (5) Moderately Satisfied (1) Very Satisfied (9)
GPA #70-Hoover	Very Dissatisfied (1) Neutral (1) Slightly Satisfied (2) Moderately Satisfied (2)
GPA #75-Brule Bottom	Very Dissatisfied (1) Neutral (3) Slightly Satisfied (2) Moderately Satisfied (4) Very Satisfied (4)
GPA #79-Bovee Lake	Neutral (1) Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #89-Red Lake	Very Satisfied (5)
GPA #91-West Platte	Slightly Satisfied (3) Moderately Satisfied (2)

Table continued on next page.

Table 10-Continued. Hunters' satisfaction (rating by individual party) for each GPA.

GPA	Satisfaction Responses (Number)
GPA #96-Buryanek	Slightly Satisfied (2)
GPA #97-Dixon Dam	Slightly Satisfied (1) Moderately Satisfied (4) Very Satisfied (2)
GPA #101-Collins	Very Dissatisfied (1) Slightly Satisfied (2) Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #104-Hawkins	Very Satisfied (2)
GPA #106-Lake Louise	Moderately Dissatisfied (1) Slightly Dissatisfied (1) Slightly Satisfied (2) Moderately Satisfied (3)
GPA #109-Reinhardt	Slightly Satisfied (1)
GPA #113-Arikara	Slightly Dissatisfied (1) Moderately Satisfied (2) Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #115-North Big Bend	Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #119-Rice Lake	Slightly Satisfied (1) Very Satisfied (2)
GPA #121-Carpenter	Moderately Dissatisfied (1) Slightly Satisfied (1) Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #122-Fate Dam	Slightly Satisfied (1) Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #125-Neugebauer	Moderately Satisfied (1) Very Satisfied (2)
GPA #132-Hofer	Neutral (1) Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #140-Crystal Lake	Moderately Satisfied (2)
GPA #142-Frost Wilderness	Very Satisfied (1)

Table continued on next page.

Table 10-Continued. Hunters' satisfaction (rating by individual party) for each GPA.

GPA	Satisfaction Responses (Number)
GPA #161-Long Lake 4	Moderately Satisfied (1) Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #167-Chip Allen	Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #206-Johnson	Slightly Satisfied (1) Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #208-Mckee	Slightly Dissatisfied (1) Moderately Satisfied (1) Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #209-Nine Mile Creek	Neutral (1) Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #225-Burke	Slightly Dissatisfied (1) Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #242-Scott Lake	Moderately Satisfied (2)
GPA #258-Twin Lakes	Moderately Satisfied (3)
GPA # 283-Hecla Managed	Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #358-Foldager	Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #375-Lohner - Vincent	Neutral (1) Very Satisfied (3)
GPA #376-Mydland Pass	Very Satisfied (2)
GPA # 418-Rosette	Slightly Satisfied (1)
GPA #420-Shaner	Slightly Satisfied (2) Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #433-Landing Creek	Slightly Dissatisfied (1) Moderately Dissatisfied (1)
GPA #456-Snatch Creek	Slightly Satisfied (1) Moderately Satisfied (2)

Table continued on next page.

Table 10-Continued. Hunters' satisfaction (rating by individual party) for each GPA.

GPA	Satisfaction Responses (Number)
GPA #535-Cottonwood	Moderately Dissatisfied (1) Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #545-Casanova	Neutral (2) Moderately Satisfied (2) Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #553-Byre	Moderately Dissatisfied (1) Neutral (1)
GPA #554-Reis	Neutral (1) Slightly Satisfied (1) Moderately Satisfied (2)
GPA #555-Carpenter	Slightly Satisfied (1)
GPA #556-Neugebaur	Slightly Dissatisfied (1) Neutral (1) Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #560-Petry/Harmelink	Slightly Satisfied (1)
GPA #561-South Scatterwood	Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #565-Sprague	Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #567-Winterhaven	Slightly Satisfied (1)
GPA #569-Tielebein	Slightly Satisfied (1)
GPA #632-Gutenkauf	Very Satisfied (1)
GPA #635-Whitewood Slough	Moderately Dissatisfied (1)
GPA # 640-Lechtenberg	Slightly Satisfied (1)
GPA # 659-Emilies Acres	Slightly Satisfied (1) Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #671-Koenig Area	Moderately Satisfied (1)
GPA #702-Rolling	Moderately Satisfied (2)
GPA #705-King Dam	Moderately Satisfied (1) Very Satisfied (1)

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

Table 11. Hunter comments (by individual party) for each GPA.

GPA #12-Covey Dam

ID: 53 Needs the dam built back up.

GPA #16-Mclaughlin

ID: 121 Excellent improvement in management of GPA in Tripp County.

GPA #22-Wilmarth Lake

ID: 176 For fishing more shoreline access and overnight camping.

GPA #23-Borden-Norwegian Slough

ID: 137 Suggest mandatory hunter orange equivalent for big game hunting for all hunters moving in a field during firearm season. Had non-orange pheasant hunters encounter more than once. I was glad to have contact with the game warden in the field. Thank you.

GPA #37-South Bon Homme

ID: 5 I would like to see group size limits set at 4 early in the season on public land. When a small group or a single person is walking a field and sees a group of 14 hunters walking the field adjacent to you it takes the fun out of it. This also might help keep birds in the public areas longer.

GPA #50-Oral

ID: 138 We didn't see too many birds out there. We haven't for a few years now.

ID: 139 It was a little too windy today. You need more crops out. I still had a good time.

ID: 140 We went to the one East of Oral. The cockleburs were so bad I spent more time taking care of the dog than hunting. The corn could have used weed control! When we got to the other side we quit!

GPA #59-Marcotte

ID: 126 This area has a lot of deer however this area also has an increasing number of ATV trails. The ATV traffic has increased considerably in the past 3 years. I think it is affecting the deer population. Thank you for your time.

GPA #66-Boyer

ID: 8 Too many hunters, someone will be shot, people using rifle scopes to look at other hunters. I will not hunt this area opening day anymore.

ID: 9 It would be nice to camp on site.

ID: 10 Great place with lots of good cover.

ID: 11 Nice grasses and habitat. Others could learn from this area.

ID: 12 I have hunted that area for 20 years. I have had good and bad years. This year was not so good; the cover is not what it was. The cattle that are allowed in there on the West End on the bottom along the river are destroying the cover.

ID: 13 Average is 1 filled tag for 3 hunters. Use of 4 wheelers on shore for game removal would keep some of the older guys hunting.

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

GPA #68-Chain Lake (Holoubek)

- ID: 74 I've hunted in South Dakota for 27 years and this was the best, and nicest job. Keep up the good work. We camp at Snake Creek Campground, tent camp and pheasant hunt. 5 guys and 75 birds all on public hunting ground. It doesn't get any better. Thanks. Dixon GPA was also great.
- ID: 76 We hunt only management areas. Good job on the crops. Wardens are really helpful and friendly. He answered any questions we had.
- ID: 77 I think you shouldn't allow over 8 hunters in one group. It is fine for private land and preserves to have up to 20 in a group.
- ID: 78 Tremendous! Great management of crops and grasslands! At Angostura they have cement out house. The female hunters would really appreciate the same thing at the big GPA's.
- ID: 79 This was an outstanding production area with corn, millet and water surrounded many areas. You Conservation Officer (Steve) was very professional and helpful.
- ID: 80 Excellent cover. Too much Brohme grass. Habitat supervisors should be paid more money. Give Sioux Falls to Minnesota.
- ID: 82 Please continue to expand public hunting land. I feel this will be the only pheasant hunting opportunity for many in the future!
- ID: 83 Plant food plots. Leave all winter for food. Millet, corn, cane, in strips with grass in between these strips.
- ID: 84 Nice public hunting area.
- ID: 85 Habitat was very good, but hunting pressure was high. The birds were scarce compared to past years. Access was fine.
- ID: 86 Make residents hunt on private land during resident weekend.
- ID: 87 Resident hunters should hunt only on private land during the resident's only weekend.
- ID: 89 Our group which ranges from 10-12 guys have been traveling to South Dakota for the season opener for the past 25-30 years, and we are now including some of our sons. Sadly, I believe this was our last trip to South Dakota under the current scenario that exists.
Here in Wisconsin, we have a tremendous deer herd (est. 3 Million) and the general season opens on the same day for non-residents and residents. I need not tell you that you cannot hunt public land for a youth hunt and then open hunting for local residents and finally the general opener, and then expect to find a respectable amount of pheasants remaining on public lands.
We have stayed in a farmhouse with a lovely couple for years and on opening day found that we were the only group in a 500-acre production area. In speaking with the neighbors, they indicated that all the local Platte residents had already harvested the area and that frankly, we were wasting our time.
Evidently, there was a drought or some people desire to cuto the ditches to prevent anyone from ditch hunting. We can well afford to pay entrance fees onto private land and hunt in the so-called "mob effect" with 10 guys pushing and posting 10 rows of stripped corn, but that isn't my idea of pheasant hunting. It would be cheaper to hunt some of the pheasant farms in Southern Wisconsin, Eastern Minnesota, or Northwestern Iowa if I wanted to hunt the put and take approach.

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

In the past, we have traveled to South Dakota even in the lean years and have been very successful. But, since the advent of the early shoots over the past 4-5 years, the quality of the hunt is now of such a nature that we have decided to let the South Dakota natives pay for their own hunt. Thanks for the past 30 years.

ID: 90 I thought the habitat management was excellent, but the number of birds was down from last year.

ID: 91 Resident Hunters should only be allowed to hunt private land on resident weekend.

GPA #70-Hoover

ID: 94 This was a nice place to hunt.

ID: 95 As a nonresident I have hunted South Dakota public land, and no other land for 22 years after the resident only hunt stated, I have had less success on opening weekend. Our money help purchase and support public land, we still have to buy licenses, motels, gas, food, etc and then hunt seconds.

ID: 99 The habitat is always set up very nice on this area. Grain, grass cover and shelter belts were very nice.

GPA #75-Brule Bottom

ID: 14 I hunted mostly public land with some success.

ID: 16 Quality fair chase hunt.

ID: 20 As a whole I feel GF&P does a very good job. The only think I would add is more non harvested crops or strips to hold the pheasants in the area longs.

ID: 21 Jack Friedal and Frank Baily have done a super job making this area an excellent place for water fowl, deer, and pheasant hunting. I'm a deer and waterfowl hunter. I do nearly all my hunting in this area.

ID: 22 We don't hunt public land.

ID: 24 I'm very grateful for the chance to hunt on public land, I only wish we had more in Brule County. There isn't any chance to hunt on private land without paying. I can't afford to hunt if I had to pay for the privilege. Thanks.

ID: 25 It was okay but saw some vehicles beyond points at some times.

ID: 26 More row crops on public lands.

GPA #79-Bovee Lake

ID: 6 This is the first time I have hunted. There was plenty of cover, and an average number of pheasants.

ID: 7 Liked the fact that there were non-harvested crops were present. Very think cover throughout which made walking difficult but probably discouraged a lot of other hunters. It was tough to make clean kills on roosters with steel shot. That coupled with the extra thick cover led to some crippling loss even with the use of 2 dogs. I would recommend steel alternatives. Enjoyed it thoroughly. Saw a good number of birds hunting the afternoon (2:00) after I'm sure it had already been hunted. Birds held fairly tight!

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

GPA #89-Red Lake

- ID: 143 Thanks for these places to hunt. The bugs were bad that day (mosquito's) and the Game Warden did not want to stick around, cause he said he did not get bit yet this year. I don't blame him. He was very helpful, courteous etc. I think his name was Tim? I think we will be using spots like this one more often.
- ID: 144 We like to hunt Railroad tracks but it's not always clear which ones are open to hunt!
- ID: 146 I think the GF&P is doing an excellent job managing the pheasant population. I've been coming to South Dakota for 10 years and have had a satisfying experience each and every year.
- ID: 147 Habitat is fine on all public hunting grounds. Should be like this one. Vehicle restrictions are understandable. Access is fine.

GPA #91-West Platte

- ID: 23 Could have some vehicle access areas for hunters who cannot walk long distances because of physical abilities.
- ID: 30 Could have some vehicle access area's for hunters who cannot walk very far because of physical disabilities.

GPA #96-Buryanek

- ID: 32 Saw about 1/3 fewer grouse than last year. State needs to do more spraying to thistles on state grounds.

GPA #97-Dixon Dam

- ID: 56 Very friendly Warden. He was very helpful. Keep up the good work on the Habitat.
- ID: 57 If we pay \$110 for a license, allow us to hunt the very 1st weekend on public land not just South Dakota Residents.
- ID: 58 Great people! I don't like in-state people hunting before we do. GFP person was great!
- ID: 59 Even though we pay the high price for our license and spend a lot of money in your state we feel somewhat use because the locals have already hunted public areas. The official (GFP) we encounter was very professional, cordial, helpful etc! We were very impressed.
- ID: 60 Great to have the food plots for the pheasants.
- ID: 61 Great land! Keep it up!
- ID: 63 I've hunted South Dakota for 27 years and this was the best, nicest job and keep up the good work. We camped at Snake Creek Camp Ground, tent camp, and pheasant hunt. 5 guys and 75 pheasants all on public hunting grounds. We hunted 3 days in Holoubek GPA and it was great.

GPA #101-Collins

- ID: 49 Have been coming to South Dakota since 1993 and this is the 1st year I hunted opening day and got up only 6 roosters and 20-25 hen's. I was in the same area October 1st & 2nd with my 3 grandchildren and there where hundreds of roosters. But the 3 day resident season on public land is ruining these areas for people like me that don't have private land to hunt on.

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

ID: 50 As a non-resident, I think it really effects out hunt when the public areas have been pre-hunted prior to the season. The number of birds seems to be way less than they have the last few years.

GPA #104-Hawkins

ID: 71 Corn better than sorghum. Very nice area.

ID: 72 More food plots would be nice. Mow property lines between public and private (hold birds better in public land). Mark school lands with some kind of signs, not always sure where the property lines are. Please mow/strip big tracks of property easier to hunt with a small group.

GPA #106-Lake Louise

ID: 106 Nice place to hunt, but need more land.

ID: 107 I hunted at Lake Louise. There were large parties' (10) with guides hunting this property. The warden that checked me was very nice young man. Gene took care of restrooms and upkeep does a great job.

ID: 108 The resident hunt held the previous weekend is a slap in the face to us that spent \$114 to hunt public land. Stop the resident hunt!

ID: 109 The opener does not see the same (not as good) with non-residents starting a week later. I like the aspects of hunting in South Dakota, but not that one. I hunt public land only. Buying license process was very slow this year.

ID: 110 Good hunting, but we needed a dog.

ID: 111 Few and spooky roosters as a result of the 3 day resident hunt the weekend before. The resident hunt is a poor practice.

GPA #109-Reinhardt

ID: 148 GOOD!

GPA #113-Arikara

ID: 1 Access is limited, the parking is poor, and there is no place to turn around. Cattails are over growing the area, with limited hunting opportunities. The tremendous cover, but limits hunting areas. Water level management is a great idea. Boat access?

ID: 2 Vehicle restrictions are good, I appreciate the walk-in areas. More public hunting areas are always better. Habitat seems in good shape. On a related note: we are not in favor of the number of lions permitted for taking (too high) and we really object to the sage grouse season (doesn't see very smart to hunt such a rare species).

ID: 3 Good habitat; holds pheasants all season. Keep up the good work!

ID: 4 Need more pheasants on public lands, only saw 8 roosters in 3 days.

GPA #115-North Big Bend

ID: 136 I see that the trail around the big draw has had a chance to grow up. The traffic from the natives has gone down. This is a good thing. Nothing like walking then having them drive in and scare away your stalk.

GPA #119-Rice Lake

ID: 154 Tons of birds.

ID: 155 You need more variety in food plots.

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

GPA #121-Carpenter

- ID: 43 Nice job on planting crops, windows of small trees etc!
- ID: 44 We didn't have any opportunities to shoot at roosters. Only saw 10 hens and 3 roosters. We hunted public land at Chamberlain.
- ID: 45 The habitat was great but there were no birds. I don't think we saw any roosters and we did see a few hens.

GPA #125-Neugebauer

- ID: 128 I really like the restricting access beyond a certain point with vehicles. As an archery hunter, it allows me to get out what I put into the hunt in terms of quantity and quality of animals seen.
- ID: 129 Need to provide easier location of GPA/WIA nearest to intersection along with coordinate. Nice area but hard to find.
- ID: 130 Excellent, my greatest impression was meet and talking to the CO. It was very refreshing to meet a CO who didn't assume you are not following the law. Need to locate areas for easy finding.

GPA #132-Hofer

- ID: 92 We need a 12 month open season on 4 wheelers, dirt bikes, etc walk in only area's are terrific. Walking back to nature is good.
- ID: 93 More public access land that is smaller in size and able to manage.

GPA #142-Frost Wilderness

- ID: 69 Habitat is good. Need to stop RV travel on game production land. Don't forget this is game production land. Not recreational land no need for RV's or bike trails.

GPA #206-Johnson

- ID: 100 It would be nice to somehow get a little more land in the Norton Hills area. It is a great spot and great scenery with opportunities to kill. The only problem is too many hunters in the given areas.
- ID: 101 The 2005 hunting atlas did not match up perfectly with the signs, on the Game Production areas East of Lake Thompson.

GPA #208-McKee

- ID: 122 I appreciate the youth programs to help them get a good taste of hunting and ethics.
- ID: 124 Access excellent, great place (people/hunters should clean up their trash. Isn't beer with guns illegal?)

GPA #209-Nine Mile Creek

- ID: 134 You may want to try beans in one field. It was a nice day to hunt.
- ID: 135 Noticed that over the past 10 years that area does not have all the trash left by some target shooters. Area has not been very productive for me (small game). I enjoy the area for leisure hiking.

GPA #225-Burke

- ID: 33 You need to do some more selective planting for food (corn).

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

ID: 34 Interior food plots in addition to the one on the edge might hold more birds. A reliable water source (artesian well) would help a great deal on this GPA. Thanks for the chance to comment.

GPA #242-Scott Lake

ID: 161 Habitat great plus there was very few weeds.

ID: 162 Wildlife area was in excellent condition. Very few weeds and thistles like some areas.

GPA #258-Twin Lakes

ID: 171 More food plots, more predator control like hawks?

ID: 172 More small food plots (corn strips) for smaller hunting groups.

ID: 173 Was almost too large to hunt with small party.

GPA # 283-Hecla Managed

ID: 73 We were happy to see your food plots, with lots of cover. We saw a lot of ringnecks we got a couple of does we think your management practices are top notch and we talked to a lady game warden who was super.

GPA #358-Foldager

ID: 68 Very satisfied with accessibility of walk-in areas for upland game and waterfowl. Maps are helpful. More hunters than we're used to seeing, primarily upland hunters

GPA #375-Lohner - Vincent

ID: 115 I have hunted this area the past 2 years and the habitat is very good. Access is also very good. Though we don't always shoot a lot of game we do see a lot of game and the walk in areas are abundant.

ID: 116 Sat twice in the public area and haven't seen a deer. I think some of the walk-in areas we pay for are nothing more than bare rocky pasture that offer little cover or habitat for wildlife. Some are very good. Don't pay for bare pastures.

ID: 117 I very much appreciate this program. There are excellent hunting opportunities in this and other GPA's. Access to this and other areas is good. Habitat is excellent, thank you for giving me a place to hunt.

ID: 118 The pheasants forever program is great as it provides excellent areas to hunt. The walk-in areas are the best way to hunt. I like the noon opening as it provide the birds time to feed and move around.

GPA #376-Mydland Pass

ID: 125 I've been hunting South Dakota for 15 years and never had a bad trip. The walk in program is excellent which provides more than enough land to do what ever your hunting. I hunt all over the country and South Dakota has the best program. Thank you!

ID: 127 4th waterfowl trip to South Dakota. Every year is rewarding regardless of bird numbers. Low hunting pressure makes the hunt satisfying and relaxing.

GPA # 418-Rosette

ID: 159 Didn't get a bird but had a good time. Good habitat and we got to work the dog. We saw many birds.

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

GPA #420-Shaner

- ID: 163 Great cover but need additional food plots.
- ID: 164 Very please-agent was helpful and answered question and explained some things.
- ID: 165 Great cover but need additional food plots.

GPA #433-Landing Creek

- ID: 112 Need more public land to hunt.

GPA #456-Snatch Creek

- ID: 166 New area will get better, need more public land to hunt.
- ID: 167 Bon Homme has good public hunting.
- ID: 168 In 1 hour I saw 2 roosters and bagged one. Hunted a walk in area Northeast of Tyndall.

GPA #535-Cottonwood

- ID: 51 Lots of Birds.
- ID: 52 Spooky roosters are a result of the resident only season. Please give the out-of-state hunters a chance on public land we paid for!

GPA #545-Casanova

- ID: 38 This is a pretty good deer refuge it would be nice if the corn would be closer to the trees. I think it would hold deer better. We need some archery or just deer game lands because the pheasant hunters run off all the deer. Makes it close to impossible to hunt.
- ID: 39 Overall impression is very positive. We appreciate the planting of feed stock and understand the natural cover grasses will be coming back within a couple of years. The sharing of land with livestock is less desirable.
- ID: 40 Very satisfied with GPA Casanova. Hunted it for 5 years and always produces birds. I like the idea of corn stands left alone around it and the buck brush thicket runs parking is good and would like to see more GPA's like this one. They get hunted a lot sometimes hard to find a good one like Casanova.
- ID: 41 We were very please with the number of pheasants present! Many Minnesota hunters did not park in designated areas.
- ID: 42 Parking, maps, and access was very good. We are very disappointed in the lack of birds in the wildlife areas. Several areas had no birds at all.

GPA #553-Byre

- ID: 35 Didn't find any birds in the area we walked. This was unusual, in years past this land offered good hunts.
- ID: 36 The youth and resident hunts have made public land and walk in areas very poor hunting for non-residents.

GPA #554-Reis

- ID: 150 Not many birds but habitat was good. Nice food plots.
- ID: 151 Habitat was good, but not many birds.
- ID: 152 Good Job!

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

ID: 153 Plant more Crops that pheasants and grouse will be attracted to on larger portions of the public land.

GPA #555-Carpenter

ID: 37 South Dakota's GF&P should only pay for walk-in areas that hold pheasants. If there are any more restrictions placed on road hunting. We will discontinue hunting in South Dakota.

GPA #556-Neugebaur

ID: 131 Rain forced us out of the bottom. Weather always a limiting factor.

ID: 133 Heavy rain shortened our hunt.

GPA #560-Petry/Harmelink

ID: 141 No Problem walking, during firearm season. I believe bow hunters need to have some orange on public land. I saw a large number of hens and roosters. Most of my time was spent scouting for firearm deer.

GPA #561-South Scatterwood

ID: 160 The food plots were very thin and could use more.

GPA #565-Sprague

ID: 169 Excellent job of providing great habitat for pheasants and ducks! There was plenty of parking in areas and good access. A little disappointed when a very large group that appeared to be with a guide showed up to drive pheasants! (They were in an Enterprise rental van).

GPA #567-Winterhaven

ID: 177 I like the idea of planting sorghum and having a small corn plot. The area is very well suited for many species.

GPA #632-Gutenkauf

ID: 175 We always do very well on public land for pheasants. The conservation officers are always friendly and asking about our luck. Public lands are very well marked and easy to hunt. We have some private land as well. Always look forward to our annual trip.

GPA #635-Whitewood Slough

ID: 70 Saw 2 birds all day. Don't think I will buy a license next year. It has turned into a rich man's sport.

GPA # 640-Lechtenberg

ID: 114 Very good place to hunt with great habitat. Would like to see some millet or corn plots in center of acreage (between the dams). Would spread the birds out more. Lots and lots of hawks!

GPA # 659-Emilies Acres

ID: 64 While this is a fine piece of habitat it need to be burned at least ½. You could easily break a leg or ankle in a hole made by the cattle. They go deep in the soft spots.

ID: 65 There have been some good land purchases in Bon Homme County the last 5-6 years. Smaller tracts 40-80 acres I feel would be a great size also in addition to the 160 + purchases. Thank you.

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005

GPA #671-Koenig Area

ID: 104 It was a good idea to close the road on the west that ran north south a long the top edge of the slope. The food plots probably help the game birds survive a severe winter.

GPA #702-Rolling

ID: 157 Thank you for having the shooting range open for sighting in our rifles.

ID: 158 Thank you this is a very good form for sportsmen and officers to meet and greet each other.

GPA #705-King Dam

ID: 102 Everything was good. There was a lot of habitat for them to live in.

ID: 103 It was good! I was very happy.

Appendix A. Survey card used for the 2005 hunter evaluation of Game Production Areas.

Date: _____ /dd/mm/yy		GPA Name: _____		WCO: _____			
Non-resident: (State) _____			Resident: (Town) _____				
Species Hunted: (Check ALL that apply)		<input type="checkbox"/> Pheasant/grouse <input type="checkbox"/> Other small game <input type="checkbox"/> Turkey	<input type="checkbox"/> Waterfowl <input type="checkbox"/> Furbearer <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	Deer: <input type="checkbox"/> Firearm <input type="checkbox"/> Archery			
Number of hunters in party: _____		Number in hunting party 15-yrs old or younger: _____					
Rate your satisfaction with this hunting trip: (Please circle only <u>one</u> number)		Very Dissatisfied 1	2	Neutral 4	5	6	Very Satisfied 7
		Please provide constructive comments on our habitat management practices, vehicle restrictions, access, etc. _____					

		Your comments and cooperation with this survey will help us make better decisions regarding management of Game Production Areas and to provide you with a quality hunting experience.					
		Turn In Poachers (TIPs) Hotline – 1-800-592-5522					

Non-Scientific Hunter Evaluation of South Dakota Game Production Areas -- 2005